

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,406,927 to Pommer, II ("Pommer").

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,408,008 to Komarek et al. ("Komarek").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 4.

Applicant has canceled claim 3 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are pending.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Pommer.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicant has amended claim 1 to particularly point out and distinctly claim Applicant's invention. Claim 1 recites a telephone terminal equipment interface circuit, including a diode bridge for rectifying line current supplied from a subscriber line and supplying the current to a call transmission/reception circuit, and a forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to the diode bridge. The forward biasing circuit is connected in series in relation to the diode bridge. Support for these features is provided at, for example, page 3, ll. 15-21; page 6, line 24- page 7, line 2;

and Fig. 1 of Applicant's specification.

In contrast, Pommer is directed to an electronic ringer circuit having a non-linear input impedance. As described at col. 2, ll. 37-51 and col. 6, ll. 34-54, and illustrated in Figs. 3 and 6 of Pommer, when the AC voltage across terminals L1, L2 is less than approximately 3 volts, the equivalent impedance between terminals L1 and L2 is greater than 100K ohms because zener diodes Z3 and ZINT are not conductive and filter capacitor C1 is charged to a peak DC voltage level such that the diodes in controlled breakdown rectifier bridge 10 are not forward biased and are prevented from conducting. At voltages greater than 3 volts AC, the zener diodes Z3 and ZINT become increasingly more conductive. However, Applicant submits that none of the aforementioned circuitry supplies a forward biased voltage to controlled breakdown rectifier bridge 10. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Pommer does not teach at least the features of a forward biasing circuit for supplying forward biased voltage to a diode bridge, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2, 4 and 5 depend from claim 1 and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5, be withdrawn.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Komarek. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). As described at col. 55, ll. 47-60 and illustrated in Fig. 28 of Komarek, an adapter box interface 582 includes three elements- a line signal interface 563, a diode bridge interface 584, and a line load interface 586. Line load interface 586 includes a small constant current source that includes a regulator 588,

and a resistor 591 in combination with a load resistor 592. Line load interface 586 is in parallel with diode bridge interface 584. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Komarek does not teach at least the features of a forward biasing circuit connected in series in relation to a diode bridge, as recited in claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1 and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), of claims 1, 2 and 4, be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 10, 2005

By: 

Peter J. Sistare

Registration No. 48,183

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000